

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Cecilio Benitez, # 249201,)	C/A No. 2:10-2636-RMG-RSC
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
)	
vs.)	Report and Recommendation
)	
Officer Hollowell; and)	
Assistant Solicitor Margaret M. McDonald,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Background of this Case

Plaintiff is an inmate at the MacDougall Correctional Institution of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. The South Carolina Department of Corrections website (www.doc.sc.gov) indicates that Plaintiff is serving a twenty-year sentence for second-degree criminal sexual conduct. His conviction was entered in the Court of General Sessions for Charleston County in 1997.

In the above-captioned case, Plaintiff has brought suit against an officer of the City of North Charleston Police Department and an Assistant Solicitor for matters that resulted in his conviction. In his prayer for relief, Plaintiff seeks \$50,000 for legal fees, \$150,000 for lost wages, \$50,000 for pain and

suffering, a letter of apology from both defendants, and "Review by the appropriate oversight [sic] Agency."

In an order filed in this case on November 18, 2010, the undersigned directed the plaintiff to answer Special Interrogatories. Plaintiff has done so. Hence, the above-captioned case is now "in proper form." Plaintiff's Answers to Court's Special Interrogatories indicate that Plaintiff was convicted of criminal sexual conduct after his allegedly illegal arrest by Defendant Hollowell, and that his conviction for criminal sexual conduct has not been reversed, expunged, or declared invalid.

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review¹ has been made of the *pro se* Complaint and Plaintiff's Answers to Court's Special Interrogatories pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of*

¹Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 DSC, the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

Correction, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (en banc); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his/her pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007) (*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980) (*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even so, a plaintiff must plead factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is plausibly liable, not merely possibly liable. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009). Even under this less stringent standard, the § 1983 Complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Since Plaintiff is challenging criminal proceedings which ultimately resulted in his conviction for second-degree criminal sexual conduct, this case is subject to summary dismissal because

a right of action has not accrued. See *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. at 486-87 (footnote omitted).² Accord *Woods v. Candela*, 47 F.3d 545 (2nd Cir. 1995) (litigant's conviction reversed by state court in 1993; hence, civil rights action timely filed).

Until Plaintiff's conviction is set aside, any civil rights action based on the criminal proceedings, conviction, and sentence will be barred because of the holding in *Heck v. Humphrey*. Even so, the limitations period will not begin to run until the cause of

²The above-captioned case is Plaintiff's first civil action filed in the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina. Plaintiff has no prior habeas corpus actions.

action accrues. See *Benson v. New Jersey State Parole Board*, 947 F. Supp. 827, 830 & n. 3 (D.N.J. 1996) (following *Heck v. Humphrey*: "[b]ecause a prisoner's § 1983 cause of action will not have arisen, there need be no concern that it might be barred by the relevant statute of limitations."); and *Snyder v. City of Alexandria*, 870 F. Supp. 672, 685-88 (E.D. Va. 1994).


Assistant Solicitor McDonald is entitled to summary dismissal because of prosecutorial immunity. In South Carolina, regional prosecutors are called Solicitors and Assistant Solicitors. See S.C. Const. Article V, § 24; and S.C. Code Ann. § 1-7-310. Solicitors are elected by voters of a judicial circuit. Prosecutors – such as Assistant Solicitor McDonald – have absolute immunity for activities in or connected with judicial proceedings, such as a criminal trial, bond hearings, bail hearings, grand jury proceedings, and pre-trial "motions" hearings. See *Van de Kamp v. Goldstein*, 172 L.Ed.2d 706, 129 S.Ct. 855 (2009); *Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259 (1993); *Burns v. Reed*, 500 U.S. 478 (1991); and *Dababnah v. Keller-Burnside*, 208 F.3d 467 (4th Cir. 2000).

Plaintiff, as a *pro se* litigant, is not entitled to attorney's fees in this case. See, e.g., *Kay v. Ehrler*, 499 U.S. 432, 435 (1991) (*pro se* litigant, even if he or she is an attorney, cannot receive attorney's fees in a civil rights action).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez*; *Neitzke v. Williams*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 (4th Cir. 1993); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) [essentially a redesignation of "old" § 1915(d)]; and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the Notice on the next page.

December 8, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina


Robert S. Carr
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

Plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk of Court
United States District Court
Post Office Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).